Southern State Normal School Library
Spearfish, S. Dak.

THE NEW REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

VOL. 109, NO. 11 NEW YORK, MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 13, 1943 NUMBER 1502

Anglo-American Alliance?

An Anglo-American alliance is suddenly much in the air. On the eve of the Republican conference on post-war policy at Mackinac Island, Michigan, Gov. Tom Dewey of New York astonished everybody by coming out for it. A few days earlier, Mr. Clarence Budington Kelland, fiction writer and Republican National Committeeman from Arizona, made the same suggestion. Now comes Mr. Churchill to recommend the same thing and to look forward even to possible common citizenship between the United States and Great Britain. One is reminded of his suggestion for common citizenship between Great Britain and France made in the middle of June, 1940.

Of the American proposals it must be said that they could be isolationist in principle rather than internationalist. We have had a tacit alliance with the British for more than a hundred years, as Walter Lippmann never tires of pointing out. It has never been seriously threatened except perhaps during the American Civil War. That unspoken alliance will certainly go on, and would not be made any stronger if it were put down on paper. Everything depends however on the meaning and spirit of such an alliance. It could be the beginning of a full partnership now with Russia and China and go on from there to a world-wide League of Nations, open to all powers that are willing to renounce aggression. It could be on the other hand an Anglo-American agreement to run as much of the world as possible, not in a spirit of temporary trusteeship but for purposes of frank Anglo-American imperialism. A disturbing number of signs seem to suggest that some important officials in Washington and London are thinking in terms of the latter. If they are, and if they win out, it is reasonably certain that this war must be followed by another and that the future is about as black as it could be.

Republicans and Postwar Policy

There is one point to remember, in looking at the Mackinac Island conference of the Republicans on post-war policy. The Republicans have a bad record in regard to unfulfilled promises as to what they would do for international coöperation if they were given the responsibility for the government. In 1920, a large majority of all Americans were in favor of joining the League of Nations and working to keep the peace. Newspaper polls, the only equivalent that then existed for the present tests of public opinion, showed a majority of about three to one for the League throughout the country. Even in the United States Senate, the League never had less than a majority, although its opponents were able to block the necessary two-thirds.

In this juncture, a committee of the most distinguished Republican elder statesmen issued a joint declaration. They promised that the Republicans would support international coöperation if they were elected to office. Their presidential candidate, W. G. Harding, supported the same idea. But once the election was over, these promises were forgotten. The Republicans will have a hard time giving the country an effective guarantee that this will not happen again.

The Ambitions of the State Department

Dispatches from Washington say that the State Department is planning to take over every activity of every other department that has to do with foreign affairs.

CONTENTS

The Week 351

Editorial

Italy and the Second Front 354

General Articles

Foggy Dawn . . . . . Julian Huxley 356
Will America Go Hungry? . . Helen Fuller 357
Discrimination by Freight Rates . Frank L. Barton 359
Rebellion in Denmark . . Gunnar Leistikow 361
In Season of Actual War (verse) . . . . . John Malcolm Brinnin 362
Washington Notes . . . . . T. R. B. 363
Parting Is Such Sweet Sorrow . Manny Farber 364
The Bandwagon 364

Correspondence 365

Books in Review

"Tell Your Countrymen" . Malcolm Cowley 366
Paris Falling . . . . . Saul Bellow 367
Crusading Columnist . . . Albert Deutsch 368
Caesarian Democracy? . Henry W. Ehrmann 368
A New Kind of Juvenile . . Arthur Hepner 370

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1943, IN THE U.S.A. BY EDITORIAL PUBLICATIONS, INC., 40 EAST 49 ST., NEW YORK 17, N. Y.
ENTERED AS SECOND-CLASS MATTER, NOVEMBER 6, 1914, AT THE POST OFFICE AT NEW YORK, N. Y., UNDER THE ACT OF MARCH 3, 1879
PRINTED IN THE U.S.A.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This would include the new Office of Economic Warfare (successor to the Board of Economic Warfare), Lend-Lease and the Office of Foreign Relief and Rehabilitation. In theory, this might be a good move; various departments have at times worked at cross purposes, and there has been waste and duplication. The objection to it is, to put it bluntly, that the State Department at present seems to lag far behind the rest of the government both in its efficiency and in its understanding of and devotion to American democratic principles. It is certainly not desirable that we should be represented abroad by our worst aspects rather than our best.

An Unfortunate Quarrel

A sharp dispute has broken out between two sections of the Jewish community in the United States. The question is whether they should work for a strictly Jewish state in Palestine, or should be content to live in a state without any definite Jewish coloration. The American Council for Judaism opposes the Jewish state and the American Jewish Conference, which has been meeting in New York City, favors it.

Whatever may be the merits on either side of this question, it is a disaster that the dispute should have broken out publicly at the present time. The one great problem before the Jews of the world is how to rescue their remaining coreligionists in Europe before they are all massacred. Already this has happened to 3,000,000 and there are only 3,000,000 left. There is a definite and concrete program through which action can be taken immediately to save a large part of these innocent victims. Until it has been carried out, there should be a moratorium on all disputes over long-range policy. We do not mean to suggest of course that the rescue of the Jews is a responsibility of the Jewish community only. It is a charge on the conscience of every person in the world who dares to call himself civilized.

The OWI Turns Frank

The Office of War Information has at last been permitted, by the President and the armed services, to begin telling some of the grim truths about the war. Heretofore it has soft-pedalled the fact that American boys were being wounded or killed. Photographs from the battle areas have not usually been allowed to show dead American soldiers, and wounded men have been pictured only if the wounds were not too grim. Verbal reports from the battlefronts have in general followed the same pattern. It is certainly time to take the lid off. Reports from all over the country say that among the numerous reasons for the slackening in war work is the belief that we are winning easy victories. A few realistic reports from the battle fronts, with camera and typewriter, will serve to show us just how easy some of those victories are. The American people need no coddling.

Have We Anything to Say?

If, in its domestic material, the OWI has needed more candor, in its foreign propaganda it has needed something to talk about. William L. Shirer, author of "Berlin Diary," and a man who knows a good deal about both American and European states of mind, commented on the situation the other day in his syndicated column appearing in The New York Herald Tribune and elsewhere. Said Mr. Shirer:

> There is no use kidding ourselves any longer about a great American failure. Our propaganda in the Western World where the war that will decide our fate is being fought, is not getting any place. This is not the fault of the OWI. It is the fault of the American government. Our propaganda is failing because our foreign policy—if you can call it that—is what it is. . . . This great nation whose revolutionary inception kindled the minds and hearts of the masses in Europe at the end of the eighteenth century with the ideal of man's democratic freedom, and rekindled them toward the end of the last war, has at this great juncture in history, alas, nothing really to say to them. The masses of Europe have become distrustful of us. Many hate or fear us. Not one American in ten thousand probably realizes it, but this youthful republic, where the common man is still the backbone of the nation, is coming to represent to the mass of the peoples of the outside world a sterile and black reaction, frightened to death of the great popular forces which this war—like all world wars—has unleashed. . . .

These are strong words. Many people will want to ask Mr. Shirer what is his concrete evidence that the masses of the Europeans feel as he says they do. It is also perhaps necessary to remind ourselves that with all our faults we must certainly appear to the enslaved Europeans far preferable to Hitler, who is at present their only alternative. Yet, on the whole Mr. Shirer is right in saying that in this juncture in history, when America should speak out strongly and clearly for liberty and democracy to encourage the oppressed, we seem to have no voice at all.

Mr. Churchill and the King of Greece

One of the most disturbing things in Mr. Churchill's Quebec speech was his statement that Great Britain and the United States hoped to see the kings of Yugoslavia and Greece restored to their thrones. There is a good deal of doubt whether the Yugoslavs want their king back and it seems pretty clear that the people of Greece don't want theirs at any price. The majority of the Greek people hold their king directly responsible for Metaxas, the bloody disciple of Adolf Hitler. Even if their king is not a fascist himself, he certainly connived in a fascist regime and would presumably do so again if he had the chance. When he had the temerity to attempt to address Greek troops the other day, somewhere in the Middle East, they showed their feelings by booing him heartily, in spite of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

military discipline. To force the Greek king upon the Greek people against their will would certainly be a violation of the Atlantic Charter. If the Allies were to put him back on the throne, they might well find that to keep him there was an unendurably difficult task, if not an absolutely certain guarantee of civil war.

France Gets a Legislature

The new government of France, set up in North Africa, now has a Parliament. An advisory assembly has been created whose relationship to the French Committee of National Liberation is somewhat that of a legislative to an executive branch. Of its 50 or 60 members, about half were actually in the last French Chamber to be elected, that of 1936, and the proportions of the various parties are roughly the same as in that year. The other members are persons whose loyalty to France and to the committee is unquestioned. No one can legitimately object to the way the French are behaving; and the more time elapses, the less justification we can see for the long continued hostile attitude of the American government.

The Shuberts Are at It Again

Among those who seem to forget nothing and learn nothing may be counted the Shuberts, the theatrical producing firm. They have just barred Mr. Louis Kronenberger, the critic for PM, from all their theaters, on the ground that they don't like his reviews. All this means in effect is that PM will have to buy Mr. Kronenberger's tickets instead of getting them free; a good many newspapers insist on buying tickets for their reviewers in any case, on the ground that they should not be softened by a sense of gratitude. As for Mr. Kronenberger's animadversions, you may be sure that we would take his word about the quality of a theatrical production against that of the Shuberts, any day in the week.

Motorists on Their Honor

Eastern motorists have once again been put on their honor in regard to pleasure driving—up to one and one-half gallons weekly, and always provided they can find a station with gasoline to sell. We don't want to seem pessimistic, but we can't recall a single occasion during the war when people who were put on their honor turned out to have enough of it. There is always a minority of five or ten percent who promptly disregard all considerations of their fellow citizens, the war or anything else except their own convenience. They are speedily joined by another group, whose size we don't know, who argue that since other people are "getting theirs" they might as well do the same. That this should be so is disturbing but hardly surprising, in view of our national history. Next to baseball, the most popular sport in America, we are sorry to say, is "getting away with it."

Secretary Ickes started the ball rolling, immediately after the ban on pleasure driving was lifted, by announcing that within a few days, the gasoline pumps of the entire East were likely to go dry. We can't think of a better way to stampede motorists into rushing out and buying all the gasoline they can find. Even a patriotic citizen doesn't like the prospect of having his transport entirely cut off.

F.D.R. and Drew Pearson

As T. R. B. points out in this issue, President Roosevelt lost his temper about Drew Pearson, with the unhappy results that always follow when an important public official gets off balance. He called Mr. Pearson (whom he did not mention by name) a chronic liar, referring to his criticism of the State Department. He didn't however give any bill of particulars; it would have been far better if he had omitted the name-calling and recited the facts. Mr. Pearson in the past few years has said a great many things about the State Department. Some of them may have proved false but a large number have certainly been correct. In the present instance, he charged that there was hostility in the Department to Russia. Every competent newspaperman in Washington believes this to be true, and the President himself has repeatedly intervened to force hostile officials to live up to our obligations to our Russian ally. Mr. Pearson said the State Department refused to turn back to Russia ships belonging to her. The Department admits this is true, but makes the perfectly ridiculous defense that Mr. Sumner Welles had approved of the

Copyright, 1943, New York Tribune, Inc.

The Exception to Mr. Willkie's "One World"

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

policy. What if he had? The President might have remembered two things before he attacked Mr. Pearson. First, no Washington journalist would deliberately falsify his statement; in the long run, he would be destroying his own livelihood by doing so. And second, the President has such a tremendous prestige of office that he cannot attack an individual adversary without creating an impression of unfairness which reacts in favor of that adversary.

The Battle of the Tunnels

Out in Colorado there are two tunnels competing for precedence on manpower and materials. The Colorado-Big Thompson project to drill a thirteen-mile-long tunnel through the Rockies at the Continental Divide has been under construction for more than three years. Designed as a combination irrigation-power project, the Big Thompson was two-thirds through the tunnel phase when Donald Nelson slapped a stop order on all "reclamation" projects last October. Interior and War Food Administration officials protested in vain that completion of Big Thompson would supply enough supplemental water supply to the Great Plains of northeast Colorado to produce thousands of additional acres of vitally needed war crops, such as dry beans, potatoes and alfalfa.

Meanwhile the owners of gold and silver mines in the Leadville area were struggling to get a drainage tunnel dug under their flooded mines. All else having failed, last winter the Colorado Mining Association sent its lobbyists to see its duly elected Senators in Washington. Senators Johnson and Millikin came through for them in fine style. An appropriation of $1,400,000 to dig the Leadville drainage tunnel was passed along with the Interior Department appropriation bill, without Secretary Ickes' approval and with no provision whatsoever for repayment to the federal government. The sponsors of the measure rushed home to celebrate and prepare for the tunnel. When they began to look about for men and materials for the job, Leadville's mine owners naturally looked toward the Big Thompson job and its set-up. Clearly, the great equipment there was what Leadville needed—and the materials too.

The Interior Department and the WFA, however, had not let up in their attempts to reopen Big Thompson, and even now the Manpower Commission and the War Production Board are tossing the case back and forth. Out in Colorado two tunnels assume great significance. Which will win its battle for construction? The Leadville "gift" tunnel to the gold and silver-mine owners, or the Big Thompson tunnel under the Rocky Mountains aimed at irrigating dry Colorado acres and at supplying cheap electric power to a power-hungry area? The decision will come soon. Watch for it, and let the federal officials concerned know what you think of their decision.

Italy and the Second Front

THE INVASION OF ITALY by the British Eighth Army had, like most great events that have been long and passionately awaited, a slight tinge of anticlimax about it. Yet the fact remains that Allied troops are finally fighting on the mainland of Europe—three years and three months after Dunkirk, three years after the ill-fated British landings in Greece. It has been a very roundabout trip that the Allies have had to take —this return to Europe. But however you view it, it is a great historic event, and one that should stir men's minds all through the prison house of Europe. For some way of measuring the psychological span between the expulsion of the Allies from the Continent and their return, compare Winston Churhill's memorable speech in Parliament recounting the retreat from Dunkirk with General Montgomery's order of the day to the Eighth Army as it launched its invasion of Italy.

Yet our fighting is still cautious and our advance slow. It is quite possible that, even before this issue of The New Republic appears, there will be more landings of a daring and dramatic character, perhaps involving the Seventh American Army, and the First and Fifth British Armies, whose whereabouts are at present writing screened. But until this happens the fact remains that the advance over difficult terrain up the Italian heel is of the yard-by-yard thoroughgoing sort, even though very little opposition has been encountered from Italian troops.

This is therefore not—as many fondly hope—the beginning of the last phase of the war. It is rather the beginning of the penultimate phase—the *approach* to the heart of the German power in Europe. The last phase, when it comes, will be the attack on the German power itself, rather than on the power of one of its crumbling satellites. It is significant that in a recent magazine article, Harry Hopkins—who ought, if anyone, to know what is in the mind of the Anglo-American military leaders—says that if we can keep Russia in the alliance we can win the war in 1945.

This, along with the disappointing results of the Quebec conference and the recent utterances of Mr. Churchill and President Roosevelt, raises again the perhaps wearying but none the less crucial question of a second front. Is the Italian invasion that second front for which not only the Russians have been calling, but also many Americans and Englishmen who believe that only thus can the war be quickly and decisively ended?

We do not believe it is. The chances are strong that, even if Italian resistance wholly crumbles, the Germans will make a fight for it in Italy. This would be in line with their tenacious holding actions in Tunisia and in Sicily. Yet a delaying action would require only a handful of divisions, at the most, that would have to be withdrawn from the hundreds of divisions still on

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Russian front. And the fact remains that, however important the Italian campaign is in the specific effort to knock Italy out of the war, it is not the major Allied offensive for which the world has been waiting. That can only come from the major base of British and American military strength, which is England.

There is no intention on our part to substitute our own military judgment for that of the Allied general staffs. What we are saying is rather simple: if the major effort from England is being held back because it is risky, then the judgment which substitutes for the risks of a second front the risks of prolonging the duration of the war and perhaps the risks of losing Russia as a post-war ally, is a questionable one. If, in military terms, a blow at the heart of German power is possible, with at least a core of seasoned soldiers and adequate shipping, equipment and air protection, then the blow should be struck. If, because of shipping, the lack of trained armies, and the nature of amphibious warfare, it is only a too dangerous long shot at victory, then we must take the Russians into our confidence and explain why this is true. And we must do more: we must make our calculations of when it will be possible, and state publicly that we have informed Stalin of it. Otherwise the reports that we are aiming to bleed the Russians white, however unfounded, will persist; and they will lead to such incidents as the unusual rebuke administered to Drew Pearson by President Roosevelt for attributing an anti-Russian bias to Cordell Hull and, however Roosevelt and Churchill may protest their intentions, the fact in itself of the absence of a second front will embitter our relations with Russia.

There are no inherent and insuperable difficulties in those relations that will not yield to discussion, compromise, and merging in common aims. There is nothing in those relations that cannot be settled—provided we have the will to settle it. The nub of the matter is that the Russians believe that we are allowing them deliberately to bear an unequal burden in the war, and that they fear that in our political settlements in Europe we will leave them isolated. The military problem can be settled by will and candor. The political problem can be settled by including the Russians in the councils which will determine the map of Europe.

Mr. Churchill's statement in his Quebec speech that the President and he are anxious to meet Stalin is reassuring. The news that meanwhile a conference of the foreign ministers of the Big Three powers is being planned, is even more so. There is a report, as yet unconfirmed, that a Mediterranean Commission has been or is being formed which will deal with the political settlements in the whole Mediterranean area, and which will include Russian representation, as well as American and British members. If this proved true, it were a welcome and important truth. It would be the first time Russia had been admitted into Anglo-American political councils, instead of being "kept informed" of developments, or confronted with a *fait accompli*.

Despite our admiration for Russian military achievements, this is not a question of viewing the war through Russian lenses. It is an honest attempt to see them from an American position, but an attempt also not to set our sights too low. The great questions for us are those of American interests, American security, American honor and prestige. But American interests are best served if the war is shortened and American lives are saved. American security is best achieved if America and Britain and Russia and China take their places as equal partners in a structure of world order. American honor is best conserved if we play the full share in the war dictated by our wealth, our strength, our population. American prestige is best maintained if we show, by deeds as well as by words, that we shall not allow our fears about property institutions, and our obsession with the bugbear of revolution, to stifle the aspirations of the European people.

If we really wish to achieve these ends, then Italy is the test of the genuineness of our intentions. We can shorten the war and save Allied lives by using sound and bold political warfare in Italy. As this editorial is being written there are persistent rumors of great events still pending with respect to Italy—whether in the military or the political area is not yet clear. If those pending events should materialize as another appeasement deal—this time either with General Badoglio or King Victor Emmanuel—the effect on our relations with Russia, and on our prestige among the democratic peoples of Europe might well be catastrophic.

The strengthening of the House of Savoy can never be a shortcut to the liberation of the Italian people. Italy can be effectively brought over on our side only by a combination of our own fighting strength and our encouragement of a genuine Italian people's regime. Anything else, however it may temporarily be hailed as a victory, will prove in the end productive only of blood, frustration and tears.

THE NEW REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

Editors: BRUCE BLIVEN, MALCOLM COWLEY, GEORGE SOULE, MICHAEL STRAIGHT, STARK YOUNG

Managing Editor: THOMAS SANCTON

Treasurer: DANIEL MEBANE

Assistant Editors: ELIZABETH HULING, GEORGE MAYBERRY, ISAAC ROSENFELD

Contributing Editors: H. N. BRAILSFORD, VAN WYCK BROOKS, VARIAN FRY, JULIAN HUXLEY, ALFRED KAZIN, MAX LERNER, E. C. LINDEMAN, REXFORD GUY TUGWELL

Advertising Manager: E. G. WOOD

SINGLE COPIES, FIFTEEN CENTS; YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, FIVE DOLLARS; CANADIAN SUBSCRIPTION, SIX DOLLARS; FOREIGN, SIX DOLLARS; THREE MONTHS' TRIAL, ONE DOLLAR

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Foggy Dawn

THE OTHER NIGHT I had the opportunity of meeting an able man who, after playing a considerable part in the underground movement in one of the smaller countries of Western Europe, had escaped to Britain through France, Spain and Portugal. He told us many interesting things; but perhaps the most interesting was his feeling of relief to be in a country where people were really thinking. Under Nazi rule, people can't afford the luxury of thinking, for thinking leads to utterance, and utterance is dangerous. According to their character, people either tend to acquiesce more and more, so as merely to be able to live; or they react and find themselves driven to the dangerous but exciting business of underground resistance. But in either case real thought, with its necessary basis of open discussion and freedom from emotional obsession, is all but impossible.

It is certainly true that an immense amount of thinking is now going on throughout the length and breadth of Britain. But it is also true that the net result at the moment is foggy and confused. The reason is obvious enough. With the assurance of victory within a reasonable period, post-war questions have suddenly become of urgent importance, and the various sectional interests are beginning to rationalize and formulate their own points of view. In particular, the conservative and reactionary forces are suddenly becoming much more vocal; but this is beginning to call out a reaction and to stimulate new and more concrete and constructive thought among the progressives.

Meanwhile a great many questions which up till recently were matters for discussion by private groups and disinterested bodies have now been taken up by the government. Everyone knows that official decisions are in process of being taken on subjects such as the relief and rehabilitation of enemy-occupied lands, international security, colonial policy, home reconstruction and social security, and that there is little chance of altering them save by backstairs methods or, after their promulgation, by political or press agitation. And there is a feeling among some of the more impatient progressives that the government, embarrassed by the pressure of conflicting interests, is playing for time or working for colorless compromise.

With a national or coalition government, and in a society which, like ours, is in a transitional phase, some compromise is inevitable. All the same, great progress has been made, the process of thought and ferment continues, and if the war is not ended unexpectedly soon, considerable further changes in policy and practice may be expected in the near future.

First and foremost we have the situation arising from the rapid success of the Sicilian campaign and the fall of Mussolini and the Fascist Party. It seems clear that this has taken the Allies by surprise; in any case it, and the incipient demoralization in Germany produced by bombing, has focused public interest on the question of our attitude as we advance into Continental Europe. A prominent Conservative M.P. recently revealed the political fears of the diehard wing of his party when he protested against the idea that the events of war might be made an excuse for tampering with the social structure of defeated or liberated countries.

The British people are at last realizing that major questions of principle are at stake. Are we going to plump for the undoubted temporary advantages of stability and delegate as much power as possible to any nominally non-fascist authority, remembering that any such authority is almost certain to be near-fascist? Or are we going to bank on the popular forces which have been gathering below the surface, and encourage, or at least permit, revolutionary or semi-revolutionary movements to run their course? This would undoubtedly mean some violence; but battles cannot be won without bloodshed, and a small amount of political violence now may well forestall the much greater violence of major revolutionary outbursts later, or even of another war.

One suggestion is that town meetings should be held everywhere in conquered or liberated territories, allowing the people to choose their own representatives for purposes of local government. Another is that whatever provisional central government operates under our military supervision, must include representatives of the trade unions and the chief socialist movements, and of those who have been exiled for their liberalism.

Another idea which is just beginning to be talked about is the possibility of starting a "European movement"—an organization which would be pledged to consider every question affecting Europe from the angle of Europe as a whole, instead of that of separate nations or sectional interests such as big business cartels. If this really got under way, it could exert important pressure in favor of a unified European transport and tariff system, of transnational organization of industries, of regional planning on a supernational scale (a Danube Valley Authority along TVA lines has already been suggested in the august columns of The Times) of international policing, and so forth.

Meanwhile many feel that the achievements of bodies such as the MESC (the Middle East Supply Council) should be more widely publicized as an example of the success which can attend proper planning by an international organization. At the moment, its successes are known only to the informed few.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Southern State Normal School Library
Springfield, S. Dak.

The MESC, by saving shipping space and rationalizing the flow of civilian supplies, has made a big military contribution: without its activities, we should undoubtedly not have been able to stage such a powerful offensive as we did in Libya. But it has done more: it has demonstrated a technique for coördinating the demands and meeting the essential needs of a huge area, comprising British colonies like Palestine, French territories like Syria, conquered enemy territories like Libya, and independent nations like Egypt and Iraq; and for combining different nationalities—in this case British Commonwealth and American—in a tightly knit and harmonious administrative machine.

They have done this by building up a really strong central nucleus of high-powered administrators and technical experts, who are given the utmost air mobility to make personal contacts both locally within the region and with the home authorities. They have also insisted on power to coördinate both the flow of demands of their region and the flow of supplies from separate home departments into unified in-and-out channels.

The MESC thus provides a foretaste of the new efficiency made possible by the provision of first-class technical knowledge and administrative ability and its proper utilization by means of air transport.

This type of organization is already being adapted to the needs of other regions; but its long-term significance will come later, if we have the sense to perpetuate it and adapt it to the needs of peace, and if we can persuade the authorities of the separate territories that it can be switched over from restrictionist to expansionist functions.

This brings us back to Europe. Will the experience gained through the MESC be properly utilized in the period of rehabilitation? The United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration has a good paper constitution; but will it be given the unity and flexibility that is required? Will it be really autonomous in its own sphere, or will it in practice be unduly subordinated to Washington and Whitehall, and have to come cap in hand to one department or agency after another?

We all know that relief can be used as a potent weapon. Will the UNRRA's political and educational possibilities be properly utilized? If there is a constructive policy in the background, our military occupation of enemy countries could become in effect an agency of civil rehabilitation, and relief and reconstruction could be used in such a way as to lay down an economic and social framework which would undercut the intransigence of European nationalism.

People in Britain are beginning to think about such problems, and also about education. Both British and inter-allied committees, some private and some official, are considering this latter problem, and valuable ideas are emerging on such subjects as the exchange of university staffs and students and the pressing need for a universal auxiliary language. But in the fog which results from the absence of any clear United Nations policy toward Europe, only a few have ventured to put forward basic ideas which would involve a real pooling of educational systems and the surrender of any measure of national control to a European education authority.

London JULIAN HUXLEY

Will America Go Hungry?

SIX WASHINGTON "BUREAUCRATS" from as many government agencies have drafted a fundamental and comprehensive wartime food program for the United States. It is now on the desk of Secretary of Agriculture Claude Wickard for his consideration.

The Secretary is aghast at what his subcommittee has brought forth. Their report is no starry-eyed, utopian document; it is a blueprint for a real food strategy. Their plan, with a logic conspicuously absent among the congressional farm bloc, considers food production an integral part of the total war program, recognizes that it competes with every other part of the war program for scarce labor, materials, shipping and transportation space and realistically attempts to balance food production needs against other crying wartime demands on our resources.

Perhaps the most exciting thing about the report is the fact that it approaches our food problem as a global problem. It starts from the major premise that "the United States has never been and cannot become the food-basket of the United Nations," that try as we may, we simply cannot produce the food the United Nations will have to have in the immediate future. Only the "planful and systematic use of all the land, labor, and other food production resources available to the United Nations" can accomplish that.

United Nations books now show deficiencies in all war food supplies except wheat, sugar and coffee. We do not now have enough meat, fish, dairy products, eggs, rice, fats and oils, vegetables and fruits to meet our minimum needs. Careful estimates show that these shortages will worsen through the peak food need year of 1944 to a crisis in 1945 unless we move to correct our production system immediately. Last year we fell 5,000,000,000 pounds short of the rock-bottom Lend-Lease requests made of us by our Allies. Next year, the United Nations will need 700,000,000 pounds more cheese or milk equivalent than is now in sight; 300,000,000 pounds more dried beans and peas; 500,000,-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

000 pounds more of edible fats and oils; and other commodities in proportion. Total production of food crops in the United States this year will probably be 10 percent smaller than last year, optimistically twisted press reports to the contrary. Total production of ALL foods will be larger because of increased livestock production. United States food-crop yield per acre will decline this year, experts predict, although the acreage in cultivation will be about 3 percent more than last year. This record is far from good enough.

The Soviet Union, formerly self-sufficient in food, as a result of the German invasion lost almost 40 percent of all her cultivated land, 40 percent of the land which produced her grain, 85 percent of her sugar-beet territory, 43 percent of her potato lands, 54 percent of vegetable oil capacity, 56 percent of hogs, 35 percent of cattle and some of her most productive sources of fish. Those countries which ordinarily produced the major part of the foodstuffs available for export, like Canada, Argentina, Australia and New Zealand, are using much more of their own food to meet local demands as incomes rise. Under the extreme threat of 1941, the United Kingdom revolutionized its agricultural system, almost doubled its acreage under cultivation and succeeded in increasing its production of foodstuffs from 40 percent of its total requirements to 60 percent; but it still of course requires 40 percent imports of food.

This year we have allocated 75 percent of this country's food production for home civilian uses, 13 percent for the military forces, 10 percent for Lend-Lease shipments, and the remainder for territorial shipments or for special needs. Our civilian per-capita consumption for this year will be about 6 percent less than our record consumption of 1941 but still 4 percent above the 1935-39 average. When allocations between the United Nations have been made and delivered, the average United Nations citizen will come out something like this:

If he lives in the United States he will be limited to about one and a half pounds of meat per week, nine ounces of fats and oils, and one-tenth of a pound of cheese; eight ounces of sugar per week; five to six pounds of canned goods per month.

If he lives in Britain, he will be allowed each week eight ounces of sugar, two ounces of tea, about one pound of meat, forty eggs per year, eight ounces of butter, margarine, or cooking fat and three ounces of cheese per week, three pints of milk per week (extra rations for babies, children, and invalids). If he is an industrial worker, he will receive supplementary rations through his factory canteen. A considerable number of non-rationed foods and streamlined restaurant meals should be available at reasonable prices.

If he lives in the U. S. S. R., his ration will be determined on the basis of his occupation. Nutritionists estimate the Russian industrial worker's total allotment as one-third less than our average caloric consumption.

Chinese per-capita consumption is drastically smaller than the others.

Secretary Wickard's subcommittee estimates that if its proposals for increasing food production and for making wider use of present crops in this country and all over the world are followed through, we could furnish a nutritionally adequate diet for almost our total civilian population, provide for our expanding armed services, increase shipments to our Allies, and supply occupied areas all at the same time.

Obviously, such results would mean sweeping changes. Headlines of the new policies would be: Put more acres into cultivation. Convert from non-essential to highly nutrient crops on a much wider basis (only 1 percent of total acreage in the United States has been declared non-essential to date: Popcorn, horseradish, garlic, iceberg lettuce *et al.*). Production goals to be geared to what we need instead of what we are likely to produce, and tied to a firm price policy and a positive crop-selection program emphasizing foods for direct human consumption. Better use of highly nutrient crops now going into feed (milk, cereals, soybeans). Fully mobilize farm labor, fight to remove congressional freeze order and draft deferment handicaps. Spread farm equipment use by pooling. Work on greatest opportunity for domestic production increase, small and medium-sized farms (half a million such families, 8 percent of the nation's farms, last year increased their milk production 20 percent, peanuts 88 percent, dried beans 24 percent, accounting for 38 percent of the total increase in these products) which with credit, technical assistance, and supervision can vastly increase United States production. Establish central authority for development of foreign food sources (by guaranteeing purchase and in some cases furnishing specialists and equipment increased production can be obtained—such methods, for example, would increase the output of beans and peas in Mexico, Argentina, Brazil, Chile and Canada; edible oils in Brazil, Argentina and Liberia and vegetable seed in Latin America and North Africa). Eliminate cross-hauling and other such wasteful distribution practices. Periodic rationing readjustments to protect shortage areas. Strict enforcement of food regulations with greater restrictions on restaurant meals. Commodities: increase long staple cotton, slash short staple, decrease tobacco acreage, increase potatoes and beans, nutritive vegetables, reduce hogs and poultry. A concentrated program to push the use of the most nutritive foods available.

Working out a program along these lines is a big, tough job ahead for Congress. It is not encouraging that while the committee was finishing its report, anti-administration members of Congress were using the recess to rouse public sentiment against present food and rationing policies.

Washington HELEN FULLER

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Discrimination by Freight Rates

On March 29 in the comparative quiet of an Interstate Commerce Commission hearing-room in war-noisy Washington began the final sessions in a proceeding, the outcome of which will largely determine the economic fate of the South and the West.[1] The level of freight rates, mile for mile, on finished products from the southern and western regions to the Northeast is higher than that prevailing within that favored section lying east of the Mississippi River and north of the Ohio River. The problem before the ICC is whether continuance of this inequality is justified. The rates on manufactures, plus rates that drain raw materials and semi-finished goods from the South and the West, contribute to the continued colonial status of these regions. The absence of sufficient industry to temper their predominantly raw-material economy, fostered by the present freight set-up, fixes the familiar low income pattern of the southern and western areas. So far as the South is concerned, freight rate discrimination is the converse of the long resented regional differential in labor standards, a differential which has been eagerly defended by many southern employers but has been reduced by federal legislation.

The first comprehensive study of the freight rate situation and analyses of its harmful effects emanated in 1937 from one of the most successful of the New Deal agencies, the Tennessee Valley Authority. The TVA has shown simply and convincingly the paradox which causes producers in the South and West to pay a rate penalty in order to market finished goods in the Northwest in competition with northeastern manufacturers shipping similar freight equivalent distances. This despite the fact that the cost of railroad operation is lower in the South and only slightly higher in the West than in the Northeast where the rates on such products are lowest!

Other relevant facts shown by the TVA include the viewpoint of railroads in the Northeast: that their rails serve the most desirable market area of the country, and they intend to fight to maintain their rate advantage. The northeastern railroads wish to keep their facilities occupied with long inbound hauls of raw materials plus the long outbound hauls necessary to return goods finished from these products of field, mine and forest to the South and West.

The southern railroads have generally denied that southerners shipping to northeastern markets incur any unjustified penalty. But in a moment when it was to his interest to do so, E. R. Oliver, vice president for traffic, Southern Railway, stated without qualification that the eastern carriers' policy is to build a rate wall at the Ohio and Potomac Rivers which prevents or greatly curtails the movement of southern products into the Northeast.

Southern and western railroads, too, profit from long outward hauls of raw materials and the return movement of manufactures. Moreover, there is an arrangement whereby they receive a greater proportionate share of revenue for hauls to and from the Northeast than is obtained by the northeastern carriers; and the southern and western railroads fear that a revision of the existing rate structure might incidentally deny them this benefit. Control of railroads of the South and West by northeastern interests may also have a bearing on the reluctance of these carriers to consider a more equitable adjustment of freight rates.

A stock argument of the southern and western railroads asserts that a lower level of rates on manufactured goods in the regions they serve is unnecessary since only a small amount of such traffic is moved. When sufficient amounts are offered for movement, the gullible are assured, an appropriate level of rates will be established. Such an argument has the familiar hollow ring of the pronouncements of the electric power industry that decreased rates should follow, rather than precede, increased use. But, of course, industries as yet unborn cannot be established on the hope of obtaining a suitable level of freight rates after production is begun. As Chairman Lilienthal of the TVA has remarked, the present rate structure makes for inequality of economic opportunity.

Lined up with the railroads against adjustment of inter-regional rates are the producers of manufactured goods in the Northeast. Naturally they wish to continue to reserve to themselves the markets in the Northeast made possible by the tremendous purchasing power concentrated there. Protection of these gentlemen from international competition has been obtained in the past by a tariff; domestic competition from the outlying regions has been almost as effectively throttled by the present discriminatory freight-rate structure. It has probably never occurred to these well protected manufacturers that a healthier southern and western economy would furnish markets after the war, the gain from which would be worth, to them, many times the benefits now accruing from special privileges conferred by the present rate structure.

The Southern Governors Conference, independently of the TVA, but at about the time the first TVA report on freight rates was made, brought a case before the Interstate Commerce Commission, asking for the same level of rates per mile to the Northeast on certain goods manufactured in the South as prevailed within the Northeast. As a result, the ICC has given several

[1] Class Rate Investigation, ICC Docket 28300.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

southern products rates into the Northeast on a level comparable with rates within that section; but the Commission laid down no general policy in the matter.

Several months ago, in a report to the President and Congress, the Board of Investigation and Research (an independent board created to study transportation problems) recommended that uniformity in freight rates on a national scale was necessary to provide equal opportunity for the economic development of all parts of the country without artificial rate handicaps or preferences. The Board stated that Congress should amend the Interstate Commerce Act by instructing the ICC to establish uniform freight rates for nationwide application, but with appropriate exceptions where differentials are clearly justified.

The idea of solving the inter-regional freight-rate problem by congressional action is not new. Some of the politically less astute of the southern proponents of revised rates, hoping for quick results, have threatened that unless the rate question is given speedy handling by the Interstate Commerce Commission, action will be taken in Congress to force a remedy by statute. Aside from the impracticality of establishing rates through legislation, proved in the earlier days of the railroads, the fact that the Northeast has a majority of the population of the United States makes the possibility of statutory enactment a solution of dubious value. Northeastern congressmen could combine with representatives from the adjacent fringe (for which the freight rate handicap on finished goods is not so great as for the more remote hinterland) to defeat any legislative move for nationwide equality.

A much sounder approach has been made. Mainly through the efforts of Sen. Lister Hill of Alabama and Rep. Robert Ramspeck of Georgia, the Transportation Act of 1940 included a provision to make undue or unreasonable preference in freight rates against "region," "district" or "territory" illegal. The Interstate Commerce Act already included an imposing list of persons, things and geographical units against which it is illegal to discriminate unduly. Hill and Ramspeck also caused another extremely helpful provision to be included in the Transportation Act of 1940. The Interstate Commerce Commission was directed to investigate certain rates within and between regions of the country for the purpose of correcting unjust, unreasonable and unlawful rates where such rates exist. The Act of 1940, unlike the legislation which the Board of Investigation and Research now proposes, lays down general principles for the ICC instead of prescribing a specific result to be attained.

The Interstate Commerce Commission, upon observing the direction of the political wind, announced a rate investigation prior to the Conference Committee's meeting, to reconcile the Senate and House versions of what was to become the Transportation Act of 1940. The time was 1939, and the investigation is the one which entered final hearings on March 29 of this year. Considering that some important cases have remained in the Commission's hands for more than a decade, the final hearings in this proceeding are coming up with reasonable promptness.

The ICC has stated that the broad objective of the proceeding is to determine whether the present rate structure in force east of the Rocky Mountains for manufactures can be simplified and a lawful rate structure more suited to present conditions established. Upon announcement of the rate investigation the vested interests set up a howl. National defense justified indefinite postponement of the proceeding; the present conglomeration of rates was prescribed and thus blessed by the Interstate Commerce Commission. The Commission wisely rejected these contentions and the case proceeded. The hearings held so far have justified the claim that the rate structure is retarding southern and western industrial development, that cost of railroad operation is lower in the South and only slightly higher in the West than in the Northeast, and that there is no adequate reason why the discrimination should continue.

Although any prophecy concerning the outcome of the rate investigation is risky, the Commission probably gave a clue to the direction of its thinking by the reference, in its statement of objective, to "a single rate level or fewer and more closely related ones."

The ICC tradition of conservation does not warrant the hope that a single level of rates will be adopted for the entire United States, even though there is only slight variation between regions in the cost of rendering rail transportation service. The most that can be expected from this rate investigation is fewer and more closely related rate levels. To the degree that rate levels are brought closer together, the burden on the South and West will be lightened.

A forecast of the vote of each of the 11 members of the ICC in the case is almost certainly subject to error. Nevertheless, some approximation may be given as to the outcome. For removal or lessening of the discrimination against the South and West, the probable line-up includes Chairman Alldredge, appointed to the ICC from Alabama; Johnson, South Carolina; Splawn, Texas; Rogers, Tennessee; and Lee, Idaho. Cutting across regional boundaries, the likely opposition is Miller, Pennsylvania; Mahaffie, District of Columbia; Porter, Iowa; and Patterson of North Dakota. The two remaining votes are those of Aitchison from Oregon and Eastman from Massachusetts. Since becoming Director of the Office of Defense Transportation, the latter does not participate in ICC decisions unless there is a tie vote by the other ten members.

If the above grouping is correct the outcome hangs on Commissioner Aitchison's vote. If he votes with those wanting revision of the rate structure, the decision will be six to four in favor of the South and West.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

If Aitchison votes with those opposed, the vote will be tied, and Eastman will undoubtedly vote with the group favoring the Northeast.

Even if the Commission decides in favor of the South and West, scarcely anyone would be so naïve as to believe that the removal of the rate handicap alone would cause the hinterland to flourish overnight. The freight rate discrimination is only one of the means by which the South and West have been kept in a colonial status. Some of the man-made handicaps of these regions can best be removed if Southern and Western folk are vigilant and recognize that the source of these handicaps lies not outside the regions but at home. But freight rate discrimination is a handicap for which a national law, already on the books, provides a remedy.

FRANK L. BARTON

Rebellion in Denmark

On August 28, the Germans called their own bluff and scrapped the remains of what they had once widely publicized as a model protectorate. Martial law was declared in Denmark; the administration was completely taken over by the Germans and King Christian was interned. The last vestiges of Danish democracy disappeared overnight, and Denmark got what the Danes call "Norwegian conditions."

This did not take the Danes by surprise. They have expected such a shift for about a year and have, actually, done quite a bit to provoke it.

On November 5, 1942, the German minister to Denmark, von Renthe-Fink, a Nazified career diplomat, was replaced by an arch-Nazi, Dr. Werner Best. The Danes assumed that their day of doom had come when this author of a future "European constitution" stepped ashore. A "best-ial" future, as Danish wit put it, seemed inevitable.

But matters did not move so quickly as expected. Dr. Best began his term of office with a visit to Norway. The Nazis' experiences with the quisling administration seem to have led this sponsor of the new order to quite a bit of second thinking. After his return to Copenhagen, he started sending one warning after another to Berlin against repeating the Norwegian experiment in Denmark.

During the first two years, the German Army had counseled leniency and the party had requested ruthless Nazification. Now, suddenly, it was the other way round. Strange as it seems, there is an explanation for it. During the first two years, the German Nazis had heavily supported the Danish quislings, hoping to build up a powerful organization which one day might take power and bang Nazi ideas into their countrymen's minds. But experience taught them that they had only been wasting their time and money. The breakdown of Danish Nazism became obvious this spring during the parliamentary elections when Denmark's number one quisling, Fritz Clausen, in spite of the Germans' backing, failed to obtain more than two percent of the vote.

This failure induced the Germans to let their Danish puppets lie where they fell. Money orders were canceled, and Best, whose main job it was to secure smooth delivery of Denmark's agricultural and industrial exports, tried other means.

Meanwhile, the military leaders got worried. It was not their headache whether the Danish farmers produced or not. To them, Denmark was no more than a transit country on the route to Germany's important strategic outpost in Norway. All they cared about was maintaining order in this transit country. But every month, conditions became more and more difficult in formerly peaceful Denmark. Sabotage increased to an unheard-of extent. It became an organized movement, and organized in an excellent way. Danish industry is more suitable for sabotage than industry in many other countries because small enterprises prevail where trained guards often are too costly, and where almost any worker would know where to place a time-bomb most effectively. At last the sabotage situation grew quite out of hand. A Swedish newspaper recently mentioned 60 cases of industrial sabotage in one week in this nation of three-and-one-half million. The Danes knew that the Germans were reluctant to clamp down on them, and this knowledge made them still bolder.

Such was the situation when the trend of the war made itself felt. The Danes were jubilant over all the good news in August, Germany's blackest month in World War II. But most of all they were impressed by an occurrence which happened next door to them and afflicted them most directly. At the end of July, the Swedish government canceled the transit traffic agreement which Germany had forced upon Sweden under the most vigorous threats three years ago.

Nothing could more convincingly bring home to the Danes the understanding of waning German power than the fact that Germany had to acquiesce to the cancellation of this agreement at a time when she was showing her jitters by fortifying Denmark and Norway against a possible Allied invasion. When the Nazis tolerated provocation from a well armed but minor nation such as Sweden, they revealed their own weakness in a way that could not be misinterpreted.

But the cancellation of the Swedish transit agreement had another and even more sinister effect on the Danes. The harbor of Hamburg having been blasted

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to smithereens, and the Swedish transit arrangement gone, the Germans now started using Frederikshavn and other Danish ports for Norwegian traffic in order to shorten the exposed sea routes through the shallow Danish waters which have been heavily mined by British planes. Thus Denmark became, more than ever, the base of German domination of Norway.

This affected the Danes emotionally in a way which can hardly be overrated. From the Middle Ages until 1814, less than 130 years ago, Denmark and Norway had been united under the Danish kings. During this union a cultural fellowship has developed between the two countries which is still alive today. When Germany, on April 9, 1940, invaded Denmark and Norway, Denmark was overrun before she had a chance to defend herself; and was immediately used by the Germans as a springboard for their attack on Norway. Many Danes deplored the fact that Denmark never had a chance to fight, as the Norwegians had, and nothing hurt the Danes so painfully as the awareness that their country was being used against their heroically resisting Norweigan brothers. This emotional background must be kept in mind, if we are to understand the reaction of the Danish people to the cessation of the Swedish transit, effective from August 20, and the events which followed.

The Germans immediately began shipping their men and supplies to Norway through Frederikshavn and other Danish harbors. What aroused the Danes, possibly still more, was that on their return trips, the ships unloaded prisoners: Norwegian officers who had fought the Germans in 1940, had been released from camps years ago, and now, suddenly, under martial law, had been interned again; tortured internees from concentration camps, sent to Germany to make room for new prisoners in the Norwegian camps; hostages, seized at random.

The Danish reaction was immediate. Rails were removed daily, all along the main lines from the harbors to the German border. A wave of sabotage swept over the country. General strikes—hitherto unknown in Denmark—street demonstrations and clashes with German soldiers occurred everywhere.

The situation getting out of hand, the Germans presented the Danish government with new demands such as leaving the prosecution of saboteurs to the mercy of the German Gestapo. This demand was rejected after the cabinet had consulted with subcommittees of parliament and obtained agreement of the different parties that no further German demands should be complied with. Everyone felt that a showdown was in the offing. "Norwegian conditions" seemed inevitable. The Danish authorities, however, did not consent to subscribe to their country's doom. A public warning against further sabotage was the most the Germans managed to extract from them. As could be expected, the warning had its effect. The wave of sabotage became a roaring sea of popular rebellion. The Germans moved several divisions to Copenhagen, machine-gunned people in the streets, imprisoned the leaders and took over while Danish sailors scuttled their ships and blew up munition dumps.

A model protectorate is no more.

GUNNAR LEISTIKOW

In Season of Actual War

In season of actual war it is good to declare
Death of the false and individual,
The visions of an old cosmology
And all who in its service quietly die
On rivièras of the intellect,
Or in the unequivocal campaigns
Of the collective man attempt to live
Like stagey kings with all their kingdoms lost.

Theirs were the mansions and wedding spectacles,
And theirs the black corrals of industry
And the operatic morals of a world
Singing the epic of its privilege.
Time is the ultimate museum where the shells
Of that eccentric preference will show,
Like masks and scimitars, the vigor and death
Of all their enterprise and nothing lost.

Though the common logic of immediacy
Has tied the dead hand to its living twin,
The year is hybrid in its purposes;
As in a mountain watershed the rivers
Take the eastern or the western plains to wash,
The polar and penultimate music of
The Four Quartets, The Seventh Symphony,
Divides and falls in altitudes of war.

Farewell the curators of that holy myth
Of our necessity and helplessness;
Preoccupied at Munich and Madrid,
They were the specialists with mantis eyes
Who pruned a thesis or a theory
While the first most excellent thousands fell
Breaking the metaphysical reputation
Of evil with the modest truth of blood.

Farewell the giantism of baroque
Upholsteries in sickened house and heart;
Farewell the drama and publicity
Of the individual swoon, the tawdry honors
Of the high arrogance that would survive
The terrors of our kind with dignity,
But on whose hands, like birthmarks of the blind,
Coil the stained indignities of guilt.

Against the cliché lyrics of their tears
The guns of Stalingrad have blasted through
The ignorance of time one vengeant route.
By which a generation and its sciences,
Its variant cheekbones and ideas of love,
Will move upon itself and find its home.
The paradox was always in the words
That crack like gods upon their uselessness.

JOHN MALCOLM BRINNIN

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Washington Notes

The President and Mr. Hull

IT WAS NOT THE first time that President Roosevelt had denounced a critic without having bothered to answer the criticisms, but the President's ferocious attack upon Drew Pearson, one of the few pro-administration columnists, reached a new high in name-calling. The President sounded as though his critic had hit him on a sensitive spot. Probably Pearson exaggerated when he said that Secretary of State Hull wanted to see Russia "bled white," and in times past the White House has been annoyed by Pearson's inaccuracies. But this time the President was visibly angry. He showed it as he spoke. The correspondents at the press conference were so stunned by Mr. Roosevelt's denunciation of Pearson as a chronic liar that they did not know what to say, and said nothing. They had never heard him single out The Chicago Tribune for criticism like that.

Secretary Hull had denounced Pearson the day before, but the Secretary had not answered any of the criticisms Pearson had made of the State Department. Mr. Hull indicated that he did not believe they justified an answer. The fact is that they did. Many persons who may not like Pearson as a journalist nevertheless believe that there is much truth in his general allegation that the State Department is anti-Soviet. The New York Times printed a long story several weeks ago reporting that some reputable members of the President's official family had looked into the matter of the State Department and found much to criticize.

There must have been some reason for the resignation of Sumner Welles as Under Secretary of State, about which the President had "no news." There must have been some truth in the many charges the Board of Economic Warfare made against the State Department before Mr. Wallace and Mr. Perkins were removed from the BEW. There must be some truth in the charge of James D. LeCron, until a few days ago director of the food supply division in the Office of the Coördinator of Inter-American Affairs, who, in his letter of resignation, said it had been impossible for him to operate effectively "because of interference, obstruction, delay and unintelligent dictation on the part of certain officials of the State Department."

In the last couple of days I have talked with two of the President's most trusted advisers, men who see him two or three times a week. Both of them have told me that the State Department is a mess. I think the majority of the American people agree. And I think it is time the President took his head out of the sand. The State Department reports to him, not to Congress. It is his responsibility to make a frank report to the American people on just what the government's policy toward Soviet Russia really is.

Mr. C. B. Baldwin has resigned as head of the Farm Security Administration to take charge of relief and other economic matters in Italy as that country is taken over. His new job is an interesting and important one, but it should be clearly understood that his taking it is a bad defeat for the New Deal. He has been hounded out of the FSA. His going is not only a victory for congressional reactionaries—it is a victory for the enemies of the American people. Baldwin wanted to fight hard for more food production. The American Farm Bureau and the Grange wanted to fight hard for higher food prices. Baldwin wanted the small farmer to produce more food, better his economic position and eventually own his land. To force such changes meant that he had to fight. Baldwin thus alienated many representatives of the Farm Bureau and the Grange who sit in Congress. The fact that under the direction of his agency the most impressive gains were made in over-all production was no answer to those critics. They wanted his scalp and they have it. They will not be satisfied until they destroy the FSA as well.

The War Manpower Commission is learning something the OPA learned long ago—that the farm lobby is powerful. With the help of the farm bloc in Congress the farm operators have been more successful than any other producing group in the country—including shipbuilders and aircraft manufacturers—in assuring themselves an adequate supply of labor. Hoarding of labor on the farms is widespread. The farm bloc has seen to that.

It will surprise many persons to know that despite a decline in the total farm population since the war began, farm employment is approximately the same today as it was two years ago. Agricultural production, of course, is up by about 15 percent, and that has meant that more labor is required. But the number of labor-saving tractors on the farms of the country has increased by 23 percent in the last three years. The WMC is as anxious as everyone else to have an adequate supply of farm workers, but it does not like hoarding or underemployment on the farm. Today there is hoarding and underemployment, with several million workers idle part of the year, particularly in the South. The extent of surplus labor is shown by the fact that the South employed about 52 percent of all farm labor in 1942 but produced only 28 percent of the farm products in dollar value.

The so-called Tydings amendment, put through Congress by the farm bloc, is the root of the evil. It is responsible for part of the back-to-the-farm movement, and it has embarrassed the great majority of patriotic farmers who do not like to appear to be hiding behind it. Nevertheless, the amendment makes it possible for a draft board to reach into an aircraft factory for men, but not onto the farm. Another reason for farm underemployment is a law which makes it impossible for the Department of Agriculture or the WMC to recruit workers in a given area without the permission of the county agent, who usually is an agent of the American Farm Bureau Federation. Reports from many states indicate that the county agents will not release surplus workers, for obvious reasons. Thus, in some sections of the country farm labor is utilized only six months in the year, but the county agent is able virtually to free that labor on the spot throughout the year. Farm operators don't want to take a chance at not getting their workers back when they are needed.

These policies do not make sense in a country hard-pressed for manpower. But to change the system you've got to beat the farm bloc, and the WMC cannot do it alone.

Washington T. R. B.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Parting Is Such Sweet Sorrow

"WATCH ON THE RHINE" has arrived where all successful things one day arrive—in the movies, where it is still a good play and one of exceedng intensity. It faces its task of showing a veteran anti-Fascist's mind, as well as that of a Rumanian ne'er-do-well who took up with the Nazis, with unusual frankness and purpose, but operates in a conflict which is inadequate to bringing out a conclusive expression of the problem. A picks B's briefcase, proceeds to blackmail B with evidence of anti-Fascist activities found there and gets shot by B—but even so it achieves far more seriousness than the usual reworked Superman script. In the conception of the hero the noblest realization of anti-Fascism is achieved. He is of such stature and humanity that through him or in conflict with him the war's purpose for both the Allies and Nazis can be felt.

Nothing will bring out the handkerchiefs in a movie audience in such number as a scene which shows someone returning to his mother after years of separation, or the same thing in reverse, some one leaving, perhaps forever. "Watch on the Rhine" repeats this mechanism of returning or parting and its overwhelming sadness a good many times. In the course of her returning, the long absent daughter, Bette Davis, is shown in her reactions to her childhood home, her mother, to her brother and to her old nurse. Later her husband takes leave of her, of his children individually and together, his brother-in-law and mother-in-law, and the thing ends up with the son telling his mother he too must soon leave. Its clearest illumination of its problem is in this parting-returning sadness; you are made to feel that Fascism is worth fighting against if such noble people who deserve only happiness are willing to go through such pain.

The filming of Lillian Hellman's play was put under the too reverential care of Herman Shumlin, who directed it, and Dashiell Hammett, who adapted it, and an odd bundle turned up. Their aim (though an introduction and coda have been clapped fore and aft the orginal structure) was to have you see an exact version of the play, but not a static movie—and they succeeded exactly on both counts. It is the dialogue and acting taken straight from the play which are so damaging to the movie. The dialogue has a cold, precious, triple-duty nature, that doesn't seem to come out of the people who deliver it, and it is enunciated as to an audience that might not hear in the back rows of the gallery (not loudly, but explicitly). One of Miss Hellman's greatest virtues is an ability to spread a rich, human group of characters over her plays, but where her lines may have developed the character sufficiently on the stage they are, as movie lines, so overpacked that they exist as a thing apart from the characters. The children, for instance, have lines to say which advance them nowhere either as children or as adult-children, which the three Muller kids are supposed to be. Their speeches achieve, as do so many speeches in the movie, a certain monumentality simply as speeches, but leave the character stranded behind.

The major part of the playing gets this same woodenness, or lack of connection, between any or all of the following—the look of the person, his pantomime, the character he is supposed to be, or the nature of the particular lines he is saying. The one exception to this, and the reason for much of the movie's success, is the performance of Paul Lukas as Kurt Muller. His portrait is the only one that is sufficiently mobile for the screen, and where the mobility, as expressed in pantomime, is always natural and understandable for the character played. In the case of Lucille Watson, Donald Woods and the children there is not enough mobility, and in the case of Beulah Bondi, Geraldine Fitzgerald and Miss Davis there is too much.

"Watch on the Rhine" is on the whole a satisfactory movie which holds its interest tightly and achieves considerable compassion.

MANNY FARBER

The Bandwagon

ELLIMAN CITES HISTORY AGAINST CONTROL OF RENT
Agrees with Herbert Nelson That Realty Income Curb Started Fall of France
—*Head and subhead in The New York Herald Tribune.*

Who's Afraid of the Big, Bad Wolf?

Sirs: If a Negro is given the same equal rights as that of a white man, he will use them to make the white man his servant.
—*A letter in Life.*

Total-War Department

The National Catholic Women's Union says that the styles of women's clothes . . . since Pearl Harbor "have become progressively more offensive." The union's comment on the contention that such clothes are patriotic because they save materials was: "So specious a claim could come only from corrupt minds contributing directly to the moral breakdown of the people in an act of treason, not one of patriotism."—*From an AP dispatch from Springfield, Ill.*

Our readers are invited to contribute to this column; $1 will be paid for each item used. Address Bandwagon, care of The New Republic. Please enclose the original clipping.—THE EDITORS

Correspondence

Catholics and Liberals

SIR: The latest letter of Dr. Salvemini [The New Republic, August 2] in part hardly does credit to his reputation as a scholar. It is nonsense to say, as Dr. Salvemini says, that Catholic doctrine teaches "that whoever does not conform to the teaching of the Catholic Church forfeits the dignity of his soul." This is about on a par with the explanation of the boy who once told his teacher that a papal bull was an animal kept in the Vatican gardens and used to trample upon Protestants.

As a child of eight in a Catholic school I committed to memory the following authoritative teaching: "Those outside the Church will be saved who serve God to the best of their ability and live according to their conscience." Obviously, such people outside the Church do not forfeit their dignity. Somebody should supply Dr. Salvemini with a penny catechism.

Where Dr. Salvemini asserts that Catholic doctrine teaches "that the secular government ought to prohibit the spreading

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of doctrines condemned by the Catholic Church as endangering the dignity of the individual soul," he is referring to a more intelligent issue. Among such doctrines condemned by the Church must certainly be placed atheism, materialism, skepticism, racism and fatalism. I can conceive of a wholly (or almost wholly) Catholic state offering no encouragement to the spread of such doctrines, and even in certain circumstances taking positive measures against their spread. But it would be most unwise for a government like our own, representing, as it does, different religious groups and different ideological camps, to undertake such positive measures. It has the obligation, however, of refraining from any encouragement of them.

I am not sure that I want Dr. Salvemini to cease his anti-Catholic tirades. Sometimes I feel he is the best apologist the Church has in this country, despite his own intentions.

Notre Dame, Ind. FRANCIS E. MCMAHON

SIR: My "tirade" was meant to prevent Dr. McMahon from extenuating the clash between the Catholic and fascist doctrines and thus dampening down liberal self-defense against Catholic onslaught. That "tirade" was not wholly useless if it led Dr. McMahon no longer to overlook the fact that Catholic doctrine contains not only the principle that the dignity of the individual soul has to be respected, but also the principle that the secular government has to protect that dignity by prohibiting the spreading of the doctrines condemned by the Catholic Church.

Unfortunately while admitting this fact, Dr. McMahon again endeavors to damp down liberal self-defense by stating that the Church condemns atheism, materialism, skepticism, racism and fatalism. This is true, but it is not the whole truth. The Church condemns also freedom of thought, freedom of speech, freedom of worship, equality of religion before the law and many other principles essential to liberal doctrine. A liberal may condemn atheism, materialism and what not, and yet he will never demand that any government under any circumstances shall either take positive measures against the spread of such theories or encourage them. A liberal will never want any government to be either wholly or almost wholly or partly Catholic or anti-Catholic. On this ground there is no possible compromise between the Catholic and the liberal thought. This incompatibility ought not to be blurred by any fair-minded Catholic or liberal.

Dr. McMahon endeavors to blur this incompatibility when he states that "it would be unwise for a government like our own to undertake positive measures" against the spreading of wrong doctrines. But here again the liberal has to tell him that in this matter neither our own nor any other government has any right to be wise or unwise. It has merely the duty to abstain from interfering with matters which are outside its competence. The Catholic bows before the necessity which prevents him from demanding that "a government like our own" suppress doctrines distasteful to the Church, and a government "like our own" means our own government as long as the Catholics are not in a position to control it. This is for them a matter of expediency. The liberal will never bow before any such expediency.

Since he admits that the Catholic doctrine asserts not only, (1) the dignity of the individual soul but also, (2) the right of the Church and the duty of the secular government to prevent that dignity from deteriorating, Dr. McMahon should not find it difficult to admit that a bridge must exist between principle (1) and principle (2), and that this bridge is precisely the principle that whoever breaks away from the doctrines of the Catholic Church forfeits the dignity of his soul.

Dr. McMahon tells us that when he was a child of eight he learned that "those outside the Church will be saved who serve God to the best of their abilities," and concludes that my statement did not do credit to my reputation.

I suppose that Dr. McMahon has gone beyond the stage of his catechism and has become familiar with Catholic theology. I am not myself an expert in this science and do not claim any authority in such matters. But when I was a child of eight or ten my teacher in the ecclesiastical school which I attended told us that Pius IX in his famous Syllabus of Modern Errors condemned as heretical the following propositions: "Seventeen. Men can find the path to eternal salvation and can obtain eternal salvation in the cult of any religion." "Eighteen. At least there is hope for the eternal salvation of all those who do not live within the bosom of the Catholic Church, the true Church of Christ." Commenting upon these heretical condemned principles, he read also a passage from the Encyclical, "Singulari quidem," of the same Pope which said: "The Catholic Church maintains the true cult . . . outside of which except for the excuse of invincible ignorance, there is no salvation to be expected" (March 16, 1856).

It seems, then, that Dr. McMahon's catechism, not to fall under the anathema of the Church, ought to be amended to read: "Those outside the Church will be saved who are affected by invincible ignorance" . . . and so on. Thus a good Chinese who never saw and heard a missionary will be saved, but a good Chinese who had the misfortune of meeting a missionary and did not become a convert goes to hell, no matter how good he might have been. Incidentally, we may add that according to the Catholic doctrine, the good Chinese who was "saved" by his invincible ignorance does not go to heaven, but is confined to Limbo, which is a place for unbaptized children who are excluded from the eternal happiness of the vision of God.

If Dr. McMahon is anxious to know more about this problem of the salvation of the infidels which has vexed the theologians so much, we take the liberty of suggesting to him the writings on this subject by the late Cardinal Billot, a Jesuit and a professor of theology at the Pontifical University in Rome.

Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. G. SALVEMINI

From The New Republic Mail Bag

Henrietta Liebman writes in to deny that large profits of corporations have had any significant inflationary pressure on the prices of consumer goods. She says that only dividends, which are that part of corporate profits distributed to individuals, can exert inflationary pressure. While profits are large, dividend payments are small. Undistributed corporate profits cannot be used, Miss Liebman says, to facilitate plant expansion and thereby indirectly affect the flow of income to the consumer, because of pressure exercised by the government.

"I have found Bruce Bliven's 'Is Congress Curable?' of July 19 rather disturbing in its implications," writes S. M., of New York City. He implies that Mr. Bliven's article showed wishful thinking, and states that ". . . even at its best, Mr. Roosevelt's thought is incarcerated in the past."

Apropos of the bombing of Rome, David Daiches, of Chappaqua, New York, states that if by the destruction of every cultural monument in the world the people of Warsaw could be saved and even one child could escape the horrors the Nazis have visited on the world he should say, "Go ahead, it is worth the price."

Robert Elder, of Palo Alto, California, has sent us a letter commenting on Malcolm Cowley's "The End of the New Deal" (May 31). Mr. Elder writes: ". . . the present American Congress is unquestionably as bloodthirsty and dangerous a mob as any which took the law into its own hands during the French Revolution. . . ."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Books in Review

"Tell Your Countrymen"

In October, 1938, Agnes Smedley left Changsha for a visit to the guerrillas fighting in the rear of the Japanese Imperial Armies. After ten years in China, she had become a roving correspondent for The Manchester Guardian; and she was also an unpaid official of the Chinese Red Cross, charged with inspecting field hospitals and raising money for their support. Her subsequent adventures, described in the second half of "Battle Hymn of China," [1] make you think of Charles M. Doughty and Mungo Park. The style does not compare with theirs, being harsh and angular, but the author has the same indomitable spirit. What she saw was intrinsically even more interesting.

She saw China in an age of catastrophic change. The immense country through which she traveled was shaken from end to end, as if by a never-ending earthquake. Disasters swept over it, massacres, epidemics, starvation, but so did new currents of thought: the people were learning to read, learning to sing, learning to fight, learning that they were citizens of one country. Soldiers everywhere asked Miss Smedley to give them lectures on international politics; once an officer said anxiously, "Will three hours be enough for your speech?" Army schools offered courses in writing and democracy along with courses in bayonet fighting—but that was in districts where the military commanders were progressive. In other districts, where Chinese reactionaries had gained the upper hand, Miss Smedley saw the painted slogans, "The chief virtues are obedience and filial piety" and "Anyone who agitates the people or spreads rumors will be destroyed."

China was fighting a civil war while trying to repel the invaders, but the battle lines were confused and people of all classes were enlisted on both sides. The owner of a salt mine that once employed hundreds of undernourished workers was leading a Communist detachment. Most peasants were loyal to their classes and country, but some of them had become bandits in Japanese pay. Many Chinese generals were more interested in saving property rights than they were in defending the nation, while others were single-minded patriots. One of these was Wang Chih-yuan, a tall, fat Northerner loved by the peasants; his voice was so loud that nobody could understand him over the telephone. Always he carried a big black Christian hymnbook; when he felt in need of comfort, he sang till the dust came down from the rafters. Chang Tze-chung had once been a Japanese puppet, and his uneasy conscience kept driving him to heroic deeds; at last he was killed in a rearguard action after refusing to retreat. Chung Yi was a hard-faced but poetic Southerner. "Men are afraid of life," he said. "They heap up wealth to make themselves and their children secure; but then there is only insecurity." A few days before he died in action, with most of his division, he gave Miss Smedley his jade ring and said, "We have our faith—tell your countrymen."

But there was so much she had to tell her countrymen that it could not be crowded into one book. In an empty town that had once housed a hundred thousand people, she saw wells filled to the top with Chinese corpses. Behind one of them a Japanese slogan was splashed on the wall: "For the New Order in East Asia." She saw villages depopulated by smallpox, cholera and typhus; and she learned that the Southern armies had carried malaria everywhere in the broad land. Once she was present at the medical examination of 180 students in an army school: it showed that 100 per cent had trachoma, 20 percent hernia, 30 percent malaria, 20 percent caries, 50 percent scabies, besides many cases of intestinal disorders and eight men with active tuberculosis. There was no venereal disease.

Most of the Chinese army hospitals did the best they could, but they were understaffed, undertrained and had no medical supplies. In the Szechwan Army, which was known for its backwardness, some of the hospitals were hardly more than charnel houses. Miss Smedley on an inspection tour pushed open a door

> . . . and found myself in a chamber so small and dark that I had to stand for a moment until my eyes could adjust themselves to the gloom. Slowly I made out the faint outlines of men lying on the floor. I turned one man over. He was stiff in death, and his clothing and the straw beneath him were covered with excrement. A hand reached out from somewhere and tugged at my trouser leg. Looking down, I found myself staring into glittering black eyes. "Help me!" a hoarse voice whispered.

She tried to help, but it was a wounded soldier who reformed the hospital, by shooting the doctor in charge; afterwards the dead were carried out and the living got new straw on which to lie. Miss Smedley returned to the guerrillas, after stealing through the Japanese lines at night.

For twenty-two months she wandered in central China, sleeping in lice-infested huts and often living on peanuts and turnips, the winter staples of the guerrilla detachments. Once at a banquet of peanuts, turnips and rice, washed down with hot water, she heard an officer say that they were moving their headquarters to a new village; the turnips were bigger there. She was caught in scores of air raids and crossed the Japanese lines so often that she didn't always know which army held the next village. She watched the trials and executions of Chinese traitors; one of them pleaded that he received only five dollars for each item of information he furnished the Japanese, and that he should therefore be treated as an exploited proletarian. He was shot instead of being beheaded. Sometimes Miss Smedley had to answer embarrassing questions. One soldier said, standing stiffly at attention, "We should like to know why your country sells arms and ammunition to the enemy to kill us with. We have done you no harm." She tried to spread confidence wherever she went, but she was becoming

[1] Battle Hymn of China, by Agnes Smedley. New York: Alfred A. Knopf. 551 pages, with map. $3.50.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

deathly tired. "A feeling of despair took hold of me," she writes. "Malaria returned to sap my strength, and together with malnutrition it was causing my toe-nails to fall off, my teeth to loosen, my eyes to become inflamed; and a skin rash and hives sometimes made my life a torment. Yet I tried to keep my shame to myself, for all this seemed to prove that I was unable to stand what all China must endure or perish."

In the summer of 1941, she returned to the United States, after spending months in Chinese and British hospitals. She intended to follow the last wish of her dead friend Chung Yi and tell her countrymen; but she was no longer certain who her countrymen were. "I always forgot," she says, "that I was not Chinese myself. To me the problems, strength and weaknesses of China seemed to be those of the whole world." As she presents them, not a few are American problems. Her China, with its foreign war and its civil war, its traitors, idealists and politicians exactly like those in Congress, is the magnified reflection on a screen of our own country, with the shadows blacker and the lights more dazzling.

MALCOLM COWLEY

Paris Falling

The Fall of Paris, by Ilya Ehrenburg. New York: Alfred A. Knopf. 529 pages. $3.

IT IS THE COMMON PRACTICE of novelists to introduce their characters to us as types for our convenience in locating them quickly in social and psychological classes. The next task is to convert these types into personalities. This a writer accomplishes by his own virtue as an artist, by his originality, by making clear to us his findings about life. If he fails, he may still interest us in what he has attempted, in sheer novelty or certain qualities of style. He is then a lesser artist, or perhaps a beginner and immature.

Mr. Ehrenburg is not young, he has no novelty, his style is patchy, full of borrowed odds and ends, his situations are unconvincing, his interpretations are programmatic and his characters are utterly dead. They are dead because Mr. Ehrenburg seems to have lost or surrendered his originality or the freedom without which it cannot exist. To inject life into his types he makes them "modern." He goes to Malraux, Aragon and Jules Romains for instruction and in the interest of objectivity he sometimes concedes that fascists and reactionaries have, after all, discernibly human motives and that Centrists and Rightists when they betray believe they are acting to save class and country. But this objectivity frequently falls away and we see Mr. Ehrenburg, red and panting, belaboring his enemies with all his might.

Even so, he does them a greater service than his friends, his most unlifelike creations. The (Communist) workers are good, they are pure, they alone in society are innocent, they are oracular and foresee (only slightly benefiting by Mr. Ehrenburg's hindsight) the outcome of many events, the strength and reliability of Churchill and the changes in policy of the Socialist Fatherland.

His characterizations are matched by his politics and history. People belong to political parties, but the Communists are members of a sort of league for the promotion of human happiness. "Big simple happiness. How the people long for it," says Michaud, one of his heroes. How it is to be achieved is not so clear. Revolution is not mentioned, but far to the East, white and refulgent, is the Soviet Union, representing hope. There is no inner party; there are no directives; Lenin is a ghost; *L'Humanité* a whisper; poor Thorez, himself almost disembodied, floats over Paris adored by the masses but maligned by reaction. In Spain brave men are shooting off guns, but Blum and Azaña cause their downfall. The International Brigade battles clear to the French border. Ordered to leave Catalonia, Michaud "actually screamed with anger; he considered the fight had only just begun." In France the other parties of the Popular Front concentrate on hating the Third International, thereby preparing the defeat. When the war breaks out there is no stir over the Nazi-Soviet pact. It is barely mentioned. No one resigns from the party; everyone keeps faith; there is no discussion. Daladier arrests the sincere Communists and weeps for Mannerheim. When Paris falls only one group fights to the end. Is it necessary to say which?

There is a paralysis of feeling in Ehrenburg's tone that persists even when he writes of the final catastrophe. Where events are most exciting he is still dull and repetitious. "The Fall of Paris" drags on to its gloomy end, disappointing to the last, and as doggedly counterfeit in Chapter 44 as in Chapter 1.

And yet Mr. Ehrenburg received the 100,000-ruble Stalin Prize for fiction and is being widely read in Russia and other countries. One can forgive a nation at war for not producing good novels. It is not so easy to forgive it for singling out one so specious for special honors and for passing it on to the rest of the world as art and history.

SAUL BELLOW

!! SEPTEMBER SELECTION !!
BOOK FIND CLUB

"Under Cover"

The book the Fascists tried to suppress

BOOK FIND CLUB was formed to bring you better books at a price exeryone can afford to pay. All Book Find Club monthly selections are $1.35.

BOOK FIND CLUB Membership rules:

- One book is sent to you each month. After examining it you either keep it and send us $1.35 or return it to us within 5 days. Of each Book Find Club selection YOU are the sole judge.
- There is no initial membership charge.
- Members agree to purchase a minimum of 4 books a year.

Join Book Find Club Now! Receive UNDER COVER as your first selection

BOOK FIND CLUB, 112 E. 19 St., New York 3, N. Y.

Please enroll me as a member of Book Find Club. I enclose $1.35 for my first selection, UNDER COVER. It is understood that I will accept a minimum of 4 books a year.

Name.....

Address.....

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Crusading Columnist

An American Diary, by Samuel Grafton. New York: Doubleday, Doran and Company. 246 pages. $2.50.

THE GENERAL COLUMNIST faces a formidable task as a commentator on world affairs. He has to catch history on the wing, and serve it up red-hot to his readers. It is not enough for him to record a set of contemporary facts; he must interpret them in terms of his own personality. What he has to say must be poured into a fixed galley—so many words a day, no more and no less. He may have only 200 words of printable thought one day, 2,000 words the next. No matter; the galley slave's creation must be stretched or cut down to fit the Procrustean press bed.

Your columnist may be the successor of the crusading editor of yore, or the bastard child of the news reporter and the editorial writer, or the sorry symbol of modern "department-store journalism" wherein columns are laid out like wares from which the customer may make his choice. Whatever he represents, the columnist reaches large numbers of readers and even influences some. Whether he is liberal or reactionary, whether he thinks with his blood or brains, the one vital touchstone of his success, from the journalistic viewpoint, is the consistent readability of his stuff.

One of the most consistently readable of current newspaper columns is Samuel Grafton's "I'd Rather Be Right," appearing six times weekly in The New York Post and twenty-four other newspapers, read by several million Americans. Grafton's column has been as consistently right as it has been readable. He was quickly proved right, and the President wrong, in the recent flare-up over his characterization of Badoglio and the Italian King. The quality of Grafton's writing lies mainly in its lean simplicity and directness. It is infused with an earthy shrewdness of judgment and an integrated and wholesome point of view.

The book under review consists of Grafton's own selections, in diary form, from his daily column since he launched it four years ago. While the book falls short of one of its three objectives—"a brief, skinned-down history of the war"—it does reflect faithfully the day-by-day impact of historical events on the mind and conscience of a fighting liberal.

Nowhere, perhaps, does this retrospect of opinion show how closely progressives called the turns on world history as in Grafton's comments on our arming the Japs:

October 25, 1939

The United States now stands in lonely glory as the sole supplier of arms to Japan. The greatest democracy in the world is making the snickersnees with which the little cutthroats of Old Nippon are operating on the Chinese people. That is the dirtiest single fact of modern American history.

August 29, 1940

We use our ancient democratic rights to sell steel for Japan's navy. Then we need more ships in the Pacific. . . . We seem to be choking on some of our rights. The business men of British Malaya are waiting in terror for a Japanese invasion. Last year they sold Japan (it was their right) 1,950,000 tons of high-grade ore. Some day it may come back and fall on them.

November 27, 1941

We are negotiating with the Axis. We, who are spending $60,000,000,000 on defense because it is impossible to deal with dictators, are dealing with them. . . .

The most frantic joke of all is that it was this same Mr. Saburo Kurusu who went to Berlin in 1940 to negotiate the three-power pact with Hitler. Mr. Kurusu signed it with his own little hand, in Hirohito's name. Here he is, in Hull's office.

Grafton's sinewy prose often achieves an epigrammatic quality. There are no flies on the following excerpts, considering that they were tossed off as part of a daily routine:

The plain people of the world have a capacity for confusion, but not for betrayal. There has never been a mass Machiavelli. The scoundrel is always the individual; the shameful decisions are taken by men and never by nations. The crowd may be ignorant and bewildered, but it cannot be sly. It has no gift for subterfuge. They said that Britain and France sold out Czecho-Slovakia. It was not so. A few men did it.

If policies were planes, democracy would fly. *(Jan. 2, 1941,* commenting on the lag in war production.)

Who whips these Frenchmen into line, to become the unprivileged caste of Germany? Why, it is little Jacques Doriot, who once so hated all things "foreign" that he led his hoodlums to drive "foreignism" out of France. Now he leads them to drive Frenchmen out of France. *(Oct. 21, 1942.)*

ALBERT DEUTSCH

Caesarian Democracy?

Napoleon III: An Interpretation, by Albert Guérard. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 338 pages. $3.50.

THIS IS another of the historical books that are written in the hope of helping men in their present perplexities; it is also another attempt to reinterpret a figure of the nineteenth century in an altogether new and, for our troubled times, significant light. Ferrero in his "Reconstruction of Europe" tried to turn Talleyrand from the traditional intriguer into a foresighted and constructive political genius; Guérard presents us with a Napoleon III who is no longer the reactionary dictator of a venturesome and short-lived empire but the only political leader whose social plans and political thoughts could still be our starting point today; whose scheme for the reconstruction of Europe could be a guide for us. However, Ferrero was a conservative who was able, without difficulty, to detect a kindred disposition in Talleyrand. Guérard, who as a writer on contemporary affairs never lacks the most vigorous vision, must make Louis Bonaparte a democratic humanitarian with a definite socialist tinge before he can express the hope that the France of tomorrow will find her way back to a constitution similar to that of the Second Empire and to a leader "with the unfailing gentleness, the quiet intellectual courage, the profound generosity, of Napoleon III."

Guérard does not conceal the fact that Napoleon was called to power by all the reactionary forces as a policeman to protect society against the "red peril," that he acted as a defender of "law and order" with the aid of deportations and the outlawing of a free press and of political clubs. But for Guérard this is not the essential part of the truth. The alliances with the Rightists, the protection of the papal

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

regime from the liberty-seeking Italian nation, even the Mexican affair and the imprudent challenge of Prussia are considered only as "blunders" in which the Pretender and Emperor was merely "caught." Actually he was a sincere believer in the will of the people, and strove incessantly for the realization of an amalgam of democracy and Napoleonism. Whoever considers the economic and social achievements of the Third Empire must come to the conclusion, thinks Guérard, that Napoleon was a better socialist than Karl Marx. The strength of the Empire consisted in the very fact that it enjoyed for almost two decades the support of the masses. This support was manifest in the repeated plebiscites that from the presidential election in 1849 to the eve of Sedan, upheld the nephew of the Corsican.

It is the central political thesis of the book that a plebiscitarian regime, however authoritarian it may be, is never despotic. Indeed, Guérard even considers a "Caesarean democracy" superior to the rule of party strife in a pluralistic state.

The dangers inherent in such an approach are obvious. But also historically Guérard misconstrues the significance of the plebiscites that helped Napoleon into power and kept him there. True, in 1849 the masses had turned to a dictator with a glorious name and a generous program because the anxious interlude of the Second Republic had frustrated their hopes of economic well being and security. But who dares to call the Hitler regime genuinely socialistic because after the desperate years of Weimar many a German took seriously the demagoguery of the Nazi program? Once a "plebiscitarian" regime rules a country, it need not necessarily resort to brutal terror in order to obtain an overwhelming number of "ayes" at the polls. The individual citizens, isolated under such a regime, find themselves unable to unshackle the fetters forced on them and therefore forego a vain protest.

The masses were atomized during the dictatorial years of the Second Empire almost as much as under the Third Reich, although Guérard does not clearly recognize this, much more concerned as he is with the realm of philosophical and literary discussion than with the living conditions of the masses. (Typically enough Guérard simply cannot understand why the working class never abandoned its hostility toward the Empire.)

For the author the difference between the Imperial "democracy" and modern dictatorships consists in the fact that in the France of the fifties there were things that were not Caesar's, in other words, that the Empire was not totalitarian. This, however, was by no means due to a particularly democratic predilection of Napoleon, but solely to the fact that antagonisms less sharp than those of our times asked for less brutal interference.

Mr. Guérard hears in the Emperor's words on the eve of the Crimean War ("I have gone as far as honor permitted me to go. . . . Europe knows that France is seeking no aggrandizement . . . the era of conquests is over and cannot return") the same ring as in the Atlantic Charter. We are reminded rather of Hitler's utterances before and after Munich.

Guérard's new "interpretation" of the enigmatic Napoleon is often brilliant, more often bewildering and seldom convincing. It is definitely not helpful for "present perplexities."

HENRY W. EHRMANN

Lippincott LEADERS!

WAR DISCOVERS ALASKA
by Joseph Driscoll

Here is the first revealing book about the strategic American front right in our own backyard. "An admirable compendium of past and present . . . should occupy a secure place in the literature about Alaska."—Ernest Gruening, Governor of Alaska, in *The Saturday Review of Literature. Illustrated.* 4th Printing. $3.00

THE SILENT WAR
by Jon B. Jansen and Stefan Weyl

Out of Nazi Germany comes this authentic report of the underground movement which is giving the Gestapo the jitters. "A book which should be read widely. It is the story of heroes about heroes. It gives proof that liberty and freedom are not mere slogans but ideas for which thousands of men all over the world are laying down their lives."—*Saturday Review of Literature.* 2nd Printing. $2.50

ROUND TRIP TO RUSSIA
by Walter Graebner

The first eye-witness report by a war correspondent of the historic events in Russia during the crucial autumn of 1942. "This book explains more neatly and succinctly than any other book I have read (or written) the why and how of Soviet Russia and why and how the Russians are fighting so bravely."—Walter Duranty, *N. Y. Times Book Review. Illustrated.* 3rd Printing. $3.00

YEAR OF THE WILD BOAR
An American Woman In Japan
by Helen Mears

"An excellent book about the Japanese way of life, customs, culture and civilization."—*N. Y. Times.* "On the required reading list of those who realize that an enemy only half understood is an enemy half victorious."—Clifton Fadiman, *The New Yorker.* 5th Printing. $2.75

OUR AGE OF UNREASON
by Franz Alexander, M.D.

"You are here notified that you had better read *Our Age of Unreason* . . . it discusses the hope of peace on the only plane where it can be realistic—whatever books you may be consulting, you had better put them aside until you have mastered Dr. Alexander's."—Bernard DeVoto, *Harper's Magazine.* 3rd Printing. $3.00

HOW TO WIN THE PEACE
by C. J. Hambro
President of the League of Nations Assembly

A warning of Germany's creed of the Master-Race, coupled with a practical plan that is "a great contribution to the discussions of the future peace."—Eduard L. Benes, *President of the Czechoslovak Republic.* 4th Printing. $3.00

J. B. LIPPINCOTT COMPANY
Philadelphia New York

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A New Kind of Juvenile

Keystone Kids, by John R. Tunis. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company. 209 pages. $2.

RECENTLY, Daddy Warbucks told his sanctimonious gamine, Little Orphan Annie, "We're *not* fighting for a new world, Annie—not for a new world for *Americans*—we're fighting for the world we've grown up in and prospered in—for our *old* world of *free* America." The number of children (and adults) before whom this brazen hooey is paraded by the Patterson-McCormick newspaper axis is legion, for reactionaries have recruited even the comics to get their message across to American youth. Liberals, on the other hand, are virtually lacking mass media for counter-propaganda. But Tunis is waging a successful campaign on a relatively smaller scale to pose fundamental issues in young readers' minds. Twice before —in "Duke Decides" and "All American"—he told sports stories that put down the hard, tough facts of getting along in a democracy. Now he does it again, dramatically and trenchantly.

"Keystone Kids" is a baseball story, the tale of two inseparable orphaned brothers who are a sensation on the field because of their mastery of the game. The story is harsh and disillusioning, for it strips the glamor from big-league baseball. It shows how utterly ruthless, selfish and heartless professional athletes can be, how they have no interest in the game *qua* game and how they resent anyone who does. Yet, it is more than the mere narrative of what two open-eyed youngsters face when they reach the top on sincerity and merits of ability. For as success comes, there arises a circumstance which not only threatens the renascence they have effected on a disgruntled baseball team, but also the deep relationship between the brothers.

Just as Spike, the older of the two, is about to be made manager of the Brooklyn Dodgers, a lad named Klein joins the team. Immediately begin the cries, "Hey there Buglenose, throw us that ball. . . . Watch out, Jew-boy or you'll get yerself kilt up there. . . ."

Opposition teams and fans catch the infection, and ride the Jewish boy mercilessly. The inseparable brothers veer toward a split over Klein's presence. Bob, the younger, leads the anti-Semitic outbursts; Spike, as manager, defends the Jewish teammate. On the issue of whether a Jew shall remain on the team, morale is shattered.

In his untutored way, Spike tries to comprehend this complex development. Klein is a superb athlete, beautifully proportioned, graceful, alert, strong, intelligent. He plays top-flight baseball until the sadistic "ride" begins. Then he flusters and bungles, misses easy plays, becomes harassed and confused at crucial moments, appears awkward. And the men brand him yellow.

Spike finally decides to talk with Klein to see what can be done to reëstablish unity among the team. And slowly, at first hesitantly, flow the words from the strapping Jewish boy. Suddenly it is all out: the tragedy of the Jew, the 2,000 years of relentless hounding, the things which set Klein apart from the others.

Tunis could have left it there. But his understanding of the entire question of anti-Semitism is far too acute. "Now see," Spike tells Klein, "you say like this: I'll never be any good on account I'm Jewish. They realize you feel that way. They know it." Therefore, the ride. "Once they see you're a scrapper, they'll be for you all the way. You wait and see."

Then waiting for his opportunity when Klein is not around, Spike tells his team: "There's one player on this club you haven't been behind. . . . You think he's yeller, so you don't give him support on the field. . . . He's fighting what all of us who aren't Jews have done to all those who are, not just right now, not right here, but for so far back you wouldn't understand. . . ."

Tunis believes two things. First, the writer need not write down for his audience, not even a young audience. Second, if a writer has something to say, he must say it in a medium his audience will understand. Anti-Semitism and its solution is a knotty, uncomfortable problem. But if it can be presented in terms of teamwork, the young mind can see how patently unjust discrimination is.

He is indeed bold to tempt young people with such provocative ideas. About "All American," in which the high-school children stage a sitdown over anti-Negro prejudice which prevents the Negro end on their football team from playing in an intersectional game, librarians in one large city said: "Children mustn't be confronted with such problems." Doubtless, the same librarians may try to keep this story from the young reading audience.

Time was when writers of juvenile fiction could duck from truth down an alley of appearance. Fantasy is one thing; distortion is another. The fact that Tunis can present everyday problems of a working democracy and be financially successful also, should provide impetus for other writers of juvenile fiction. The growing generation needs more books of this kind.

ARTHUR HEPNER

Contributors

JULIAN HUXLEY, English biologist and writer, is a contributing editor of The New Republic.

FRANK L. BARTON is a government economist in Washington. The views expressed in his article are entirely his own.

GUNNAR LEISTIKOW, formerly columnist and foreign editor of Social-Demokraten (Copenhagen), has traveled widely in the Baltic countries and is now in the United States. He has previously contributed to The New Republic.

JOHN MALCOLM BRINNIN once edited two little magazines, New Writers and Signature. In 1942 he published two volumes of poetry, "The Garden Is Political" (Macmillan) and "The Lincoln Lyrics" (New Directions). He is now teaching English at Vassar.

SAUL BELLOW has contributed short stories to the Partisan Review. His first novel, "The Dangling Man," is to be published by The Vanguard Press early this winter.

ALBERT DEUTSCH, daily columnist for the newspaper PM, is the author of "The Mentally Ill in America" and co-author of "The History of Public Welfare in New York."

HENRY W. EHRMANN is a member of the research staff of the Graduate Faculty of the New School for Social Research.

ARTHUR HEPNER is a newspaperman living in New York City.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED